

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 04-7748**

---

COREY LORENZO WOODFOLK,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

STATE OF MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. J. Frederick Motz, District Judge. (CA-02-3836)

---

Submitted: February 11, 2005

Decided: March 2, 2005

---

Before MICHAEL, TRAXLER, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Corey Lorenzo Woodfolk, Appellant Pro Se. Mary Ann Rapp Ince, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Corey Lorenzo Woodfolk, a state prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000); see Reid v. Angelone, 369 F.3d 363, 368-69, 374 n.7 (4th Cir. 2004). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of his constitutional claims is debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Woodfolk has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny Woodfolk's motion to amend the pleadings, and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED